

**The Times-Dispatch**  
DAILY-WEEKLY-SUNDAY

Business Office	916 E. Main Street
Advertising Office	1103 Hull Street
Editorial Office	1103 N. Sycamore Street
Subscription Office	215 Eighth Street

BY MAIL: One Six Three One  
POSTAGE PAID Year. Mo. Mo. Mo.  
Daily with Sunday \$6.00 \$3.00 \$1.50 .55  
Daily without Sunday 4.00 2.00 1.00 .35  
Sunday edition only 1.00 .50 .25 .10  
Weekly (Wednesday) 2.00 .50 .25 .10

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond and Suburbs, Manchester and Petersburg.

One Week  
Daily with Sunday 34 cents  
Daily without Sunday 10 cents  
Sunday only 5 cents

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1910.

**PENNSYLVANIA'S POLICE.**

The strike situation in Philadelphia has changed wonderfully since the 200 State policemen rode into town. Strikers made them not fear the regular officers of the city are covered before the determined officers of the State. Police men whose sympathy with the strikers made them negligent or worse are shamed into action by the courage and discipline of the newcomers. The 200 are proving themselves worth a thousand patrolmen.

Other countries have long since found the value of such men. European countries have come to rely upon state police more than upon the urban guardians of the law or upon the regular troops. In Russia the government has found its only safety in these swift-riding constables who are scattered throughout the empire. In France the gendarmes are the most efficient of all police. The men employed by the municipalities do well enough in ordinary times, the French think, but when Paris is in ferment or Lyons is in riot the gendarmes are always called on.

We have been slow to copy this system in America. To be sure, in old days, Virginia had a State guard of fifty men, who amused themselves by standing around the Capitol Square and answering occasional riot calls. These men were not especially notable either for bravery or for efficiency, but they served their day and generation, much to the indignation of abolitionist visitors, who saw in them the minions of a so-called slavery. In addition, Texas has but recently disbanded her famous Rangers. But with these exceptions, Pennsylvania has been the only State, so far as we recall, that has kept a battalion of men ready to move where militia would not be useful.

The States have been deterred from establishing such forces by the deep-seated opposition to a standing army. People confused constables and soldiers, mistook policemen for troopers. Then, too, the constitutional provision that no State should keep a standing army in time of peace has held back those who appreciated the merit of the system.

Thus far we have lost little by not having such troops. Few great emergencies arise which cannot be met by the police or the militia. At the same time, it is well to know that a weapon can be wielded when necessary.

**THE COST OF GOVERNMENT.**

Senator Aldrich says that he could run the government for \$30,000,000 a year less than it is costing now. In all probability he could do a great deal better than that. If the government were run as the ordinary big corporation is run, its costs could be enormously reduced. A proposal is now before Congress to establish a commission on business methods for the government, with exactly this object in view. Opposition has appeared on the ground that the country already has too many commissions for this, and that the other thing, which is certainly true, but this is exactly where the new board would come in. It would cut up some of the others and then disappear itself. Instead of adding to the number of commissions, its purpose is to subtract from them.

There is no doubt that such a commission could do a great work in overhauling all the multifarious departments, cutting out duplication, running down expensive leaks and the like. There is no doubt in the world that the cost of government to the taxpayers is decidedly greater than it need be. This money is empty worth saving, and it is well within the reach of Congress to cut out the extravagances and practice some needed household economies. The proposed commission is a sensible and practical move in the right direction.

**GOOD FOR MR. KERNS.**

President H. O. Kerns, of the Bright Tobacco Growers' Protective Association, has made a fine stand for law-abiding and orderly methods in this body's work for the tobacco pool. His has always been known as a strong hand over the more excitable element in his association, but his ringing message the other day shows him to better advantage than ever. We shall not reproduce the whole letter, though it is worth it, but shall compliment its writer warmly for the following expression:

If any depredations are committed in the name of the association, I will assist in having the perpetrators brought to justice with the same zealous determination I would prosecute any other criminal. No man who is a friend of the movement would be guilty of posting night rider notices. Believing the only way the farmers could protect their interests was by co-operation, I have for several years used my influence along that line, but if predatory methods and coercion are going to be used, I will be compelled to sever any connection with the association.

The association can do much better without its hotheads than

without Mr. Kerns, whose sentiments, of we mistake not, have the very solid public opinion of Virginia behind them. Night riders will never be tolerated here for a moment, and in serving this frank warning Mr. Kerns is doing all that a man can do to save the more turbulently inclined poolers from themselves.

**AMERICAN CLOTHES MADE FOR FOREIGNERS ONLY.**

The New York Journal of Commerce calls attention to a more or less familiar wonder of the tariff as illustrated, rarely well, in the clothing industry. By the drawback provision of the woolen schedule, American manufacturers are deliberately invited and encouraged to sell clothes at a much lower price abroad than, practically, they are permitted to accept in this country. They import excellent foreign cloth, make it into clothing, and ship it back to Europe to compete with foreign goods. They are enabled to do this by the drawback of 99 per cent. of the duty, which applies only to goods sold in foreign markets. Woollens used in the home market must pay the full duty.

Consider just what this means. A manufacturer makes up a lot of men's suits out of foreign woollens, and, without the duty remitted, he sells these to the retailers, let us say, at \$12.50 a suit. There is a great demand for such suits as these, and the retailer's price of, say, \$20, would give a fine value to large numbers of American men. But now the government steps in and says that the manufacturer cannot sell to American retailers at so low a price; that the low price is for foreigners only, and that if he wants to do business with his own countrymen he must tack the full customs tax upon his suits, which makes it necessary for the storekeeper to ask, say, \$30 apiece for them. That price is prohibitive to thousands of men, who are thus kept by the discrimination of their own government in favor of foreigners, from buying these good clothes, and compelled to buy poorer stuff. As for the manufacturers, they are not inconvenienced, for they can readily find a profitable market for their goods abroad, and this is just what they are doing.

Now it must be remembered that this selling of American clothes in Europe at a lower price than at home is no mere incidental happening, no occasional marketing of surplus products in order to keep the mills going full time or to avoid breaking prices at home. It is developing into a regular and settled trade policy, distinctly invited and encouraged by law and decidedly to the disadvantage of all American wearers of clothes. What is the reason for it in common sense or justice? The heavy duty on raw wool is at the base of this mighty wall of protection. A table which we printed the other day showed that this duty had entirely failed to build up the sheep-raising industry in America, so far as New England is concerned at any rate. Is the duty on woollens worth to the country anything like the burden it lays upon every family and every home? It is impossible to imagine that it is.

**ENLARGE THE TAX COMMISSION.**

No one presumes that the State Tax Commission has yet been given its final form. The bill now before the House Finance Committee was seriously debated and carefully considered before it was given the approval of the Senate, but it may be improved by the House. It has the essential features demanded by conditions, but it has defects which can certainly be corrected by the lower house.

We take it for granted that the House will approve that clause of the bill which provides for a tax expert. If it does not, the bill will be so much waste paper. The expert agreed upon, the discussion in the House will probably center about the personnel of the commission. That section of the Senate bill which limits the membership of the commission to the Governor, the chairman of the Corporation Commission and the expert will be opposed and amended. The House will see the bad policy of placing so heavy a burden on two officers of the government who have a thousand details of other business demanding their attention, and the House will hesitate to intrust this work to two men who cannot give it the close and detailed attention it demands.

Of course, the Governor and Chairman Prentiss should be members of the commission, both are trained men. Both are familiar with many features of the tax question. But neither of them, we believe, will be willing to assume the task of passing on the taxation of Virginia's many industries without the help of other trained men. They will most surely bear out those members of the House who wish to add new members to the commission. They, above all others, will be anxious to have the expert opinion of men whose experience in the State has given them a particular insight into the changes necessary for the improvement of our tax laws.

The question then arises: Who should be the other members of the commission? If the original idea of the Senate bill is restored, and if the commission is to be made up of five members, who are the men best equipped for this service in the State? What men can do the most efficient service for the State?

We believe the Assembly will have little difficulty in making its choice. Speaker Byrd and President Pro Tem. Echols are the men. They have experience. They have ability. They are perhaps more familiar with conditions in the State than any other two men that might be named. In addition, they will be in a position to materially aid such tax legislation as may be recommended to the Assembly of 1912.

There can be but one objection to these appointments—the fact that they will call for a per diem. Many members will hesitate to establish a prece-

dent in this way, while others will balk at the cost. The Times-Dispatch realizes the force of this objection in the large, and has an unalterable opposition to the creation of unnecessary offices. But we think an exception should be made in this case. No permanent offices are created, no heavy expense will be incurred. More than this, the State is too great to endanger itself by half-measures. The services of these men may save the State thousands of dollars. The work of others, less efficient, or the work of less men, might cause us to lose many thousands more. While we are to have a tax commission, let us make it the best that Virginia can produce.

Some time yet to peekaboos.

The Baltimore American thinks that "there are many good reasons why the new Governor of Maryland should be a Republican." Doubtless there are, but of good reasons, but the trouble is that there are not enough good Republicans.

Some of the Northern newspapers show signs of wanting to palm off Cairo, Ill., as a Southern State. The contribution is entirely unsuited to our needs, is unavailable for publication and is accordingly returned herewith.

May he never sink to the name of Bothing Nelson, anyway!

Philadelphia puts up a pretty good fight for a city that subsists almost wholly on scrap.

Congress expresses a desire to have a look at Perry's proofs. The downright rudeness of some of these congressional fellows passes all belief.

Our contemporaries are printing the fact that it was a German poet named Mathias Ringman who gave America its name. We can all congratulate ourselves on the fact that Mathias refrained from giving America his name.

When she really puts her mind to it, spring can put over a fine bunch of relapses.

Linotypers have to be on their jobs night and day to avoid printing Bulgarians as vulgarians.

By the death of his father, Helle de Sagan has become a Highness, and we have no doubt his wife will raise his allowance a few simoleons per week.

It is true that the Richmond young men's fancies are now turning lightly to thoughts of loving the little star-eyed blondes, but as they do that 365 days in the year, there's no proof here that spring is on.

The new Senator from Mississippi is named Leroy Percy, which is as good as any ever coined by The Duchess.

**TILMAN'S CAREER.**

If Carolina Senator Dies, Unique and Interesting Phase Passed Away.

There is an appealing pathos to the spectacle of Benjamin Tilman, carried stricken from the field, to spend his remaining days "the spent and maimed soldier," the favorite of his friends, the strong and turbulent spirit for a little while longer must fret in illness and helplessness. The death of this great fighter who took and gave no quarter will know him no more. The gladiator retires with dejected and weary eyes, his hands, having down his eyes the lights of other men.

His has been a remarkable career, a wonderful career in its turbulence and in the success which it has won. He was the strong man, always, sometimes unjust, but never weak. Mankind, in its progress through life, has been divided into two classes, the Norse and the Hindu. The Hindu is the subtle, the adroit and the cunning. The Norse is the man who knows no except breast to breast and who knows no weapon but the two-handed sword. A two-handed sword, however, he would use when he could and taking his own share of blows when he must. As he had softened the asperities of his combative nature, he had ceased to look upon a political career as a sort of Donnybrook Fair. He had high regard for the kind of a fight, and he was even according honest motive to his political enemies, and his fierce and uncompromising nature was not in his outlook on his fellowmen. He was an able Senator, much abler than the world gave him credit for, but he was not a politician. He was the man who knew the United States. It was his misfortune to be regarded as "The wild man" when he entered that forensic arena, but he lived his life as a man, not as a politician. He was a man of the South in Tilman's time has perhaps sent some abler men to the Senate than he, but their number has been few, very few.—Montgomery Advertiser.

**RESTRAINING TRADE.**

Indictment of Cold Storage Company Presents Novel Legal Features.

The grand jury of Hudson county, N. J., which has been hearing evidence of conspiracy against the directors of the American Packing Company, is reported to have found true bills against the accused, with the exception of that member of the board who is a resident of New York City. The grand jury was organized at the instance of an attorney-at-law rather than as one competent in the packing business. The case is of extraordinary interest, in view of the fact that the defendants thus promptly reached are all of the class commonly referred to as "higher up," but because this is the first time in which the grand jury has figured as a medium for an alleged restraint of trade between the States, and between the States and the foreign world. The charge is made at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them, and to let the market be controlled by a few individuals, the restraint is a restraint of trade, and is therefore illegal. The grand jury was charged explicitly and at length as to how they should restrain the intervention of cold storage operations. The grand jury found that cold storage of itself is a beneficial process, calculated to enhance the general welfare. Restraint of commodities in such fashion is not to be regarded as essentially inimical to the public interests, but rather the contrary. However, if the purpose of the restraint is to stifle the market, the commodities for a timely distribution, but forcibly to withhold them,